

medium.

23. The method of claim 17, wherein the Requestor and the End-user are the same.

Remarks - General

Applicant has rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the objections and define the invention patentably over the prior art. Specifically, greater emphasis has been placed in the wording to emphasize that the focus of the Claims center around the specifications for the authentication information rather than the authentication records themselves. As well, emphasis has been placed on the use of unique id associations throughout the system, including for specification records, to highlight that separation between the specification records and the End-user data permits flexibilities not present in the prior art.

The Objections to the Claims

#1 & 2 of the Office Action Letter: Applicant has rewritten all claims to ensure antecedents are specified and punctuation and grammatical errors are corrected. The wording in claims 2-16 and 18-23 has been revised to correct the minor informalities noted. Accordingly the applicant submits that the Claim Objections in 1. and 2. have been overcome and therefore requests withdrawal of these objection.

The Rejection of Claims Under 35. U.S.C. 112

#3 of the Office Action Letter: Applicant has revised Claim 1 to discuss a method and the steps of the method. As well the reference to “outputting” has been changed to “manipulation” of authentication specifications. The Applicant submits that the Claim is thus definite and complete.

#4 of the Office Action Letter: Applicant has revised Claims 2-4, 13, and 14 as well as Claims 19-22 to more clearly state that the manipulation of data can be one or both of the referenced data manipulations. The Applicant submits the claims are thus definite and clear.

The Rejection of Claims Under 35. U.S.C. 103

#5 of the Office Action Letter: Claims 1-23 were rejected as unpatentable over Steele et al. (US Patent 7016877) and Kanaishi et al. (US PgPub 2003/0115489). Steele shows a method and system of

managing consumer information over a network. Kanaishi shows a system and method for transmitting personal information and for acquiring the personal information. The revised wording make clear that the Claims deal with specifications data rather than the End-user records and overcomes any suggestion it is not patentable over the prior art. Steele and Kanaishi do not require that a unique identifier be sent along with the initial input screen in both the sign-up and logon steps and thus do not permit the automated and dynamic changes to the input screens in a manner similar to claims 1-23. Also, the prior art does not contemplate or suggest a unique token be set for sign-up records/logon records and a unique mapping for sign-up records/logon records be used in association with a requestor id. Separation of the specification parameters in this way allows additional flexibilities not possible with the prior art. Specifics are discussed in detail below.

#6 of the Office Action Letter: Claim 1 requires a Sign-up specification assignment step requiring the presence of both the requestor id and a unique sign-up id and maintenance of the associations between them and the sign-up specification records. This language distinguishes over Steele as Steele does not show, at column 15 lines 16-57. fig. 4 or elsewhere, the transmission of these ids and the creation and maintenance of the associations between these ids and the specification records. Although Steele uses ids such as in column 15 line 43 and also uses specification records such as in column 15 line 21-22 in “profile record 302a”, Steele does not use the id and profile record in the associative manner of the Sign-up specification assignment step of Claim 1.

Claim 1 requires a Logon specification assignment step requiring the presence of both the requestor id and a unique logon id and maintenance of the associations between them and the logon specification records. This language distinguishes over Steele as Steele does not show, at column 15 lines 16-57. fig. 4 or elsewhere, the transmission of these ids and the creation and maintenance of the associations between these ids and the specification records. As a consequence of the ids and associations required in the Logon specification assignment step, the present invention requires a structure such as in Fig. 1 where record databases 115 & 118 (containing user data), specification databases 116 & 117 (containing specifications data) and association tables 112, 113, & 114, are necessary. This distinguishes over Steele as Steele does not show this structure and although Steele at Column 15 line 49 in data schema 400 “may also include profile record 302a”, it does not show or contemplate the use of the ids in the associative manner described in the Logon specifications assignment step.

Claim 1 requires a Sign-up receiving step requiring the presence of both the requestor id and a sign-up id. This language distinguishes over Steele as Steele does not show, at column 16 lines 46-column 17 line 45 or elsewhere, the transmission of these ids. Although Steele at column 17 lines 5-10 uses ids (such as vendor id, products id and applications id) and states “(d)epending on the structure of the information” when they are to be used (such as for “filtered” results), none of these ids have the characteristics of a sign-up id nor are they used in a similar associative manner. Also, since Claim 1 requires that the requestor id and signup id be sent, it allows the “signup interface” page to be absent or unavailable unless and until a valid sign-up id and requestor id combination are first received. The prior art does not allow this. In Steele at column 17 line 39 at step 528, 116 displays the consumer inputting interface without the need to pass a sign-up id (or any other id) and thus the entire prior process to create this inputting interface in Steele could have been a result of a previously generated page (although with certain 'customer' or 'vendor' specified fields) but absent the associative requestor id-signup id combination or the necessity to pass them to the server system before the End User input interface which Claim 1 does not permit. Also in Steele at column 16 line 65-column 17 line 5 at step 512-514 the client side application retrieves “consumer information elements from the information account 110” but account 110 contains the End-user records rather than the specifications for the records.

Claim 1 requires a Logon receiving step requiring the presence of both the requestor id and a logon id. This language distinguishes over Steele as Steele does not show, at column 16 lines 46-column 17 line 45 or elsewhere, the transmission of these ids. Although Steele uses a logon page at step 506, the client side application at 105 in Steele displays the login interface without the need for ids (requestor id, logon id or otherwise) to be received first. Also, since Claim 1 requires that the requestor id and logon id be sent, it allows the “logon interface” page to be absent or unavailable unless and until a valid logon id - requestor id combination are first received. The prior art does not allow this. In Steele the logon interface is shown without the need to pass a logon id (or any other id) and thus the entire prior process to create a logon page in Steele could have been a result of a previously generated page (although with certain 'customer' or 'vendor' specified fields) but absent the associative requestor id – logon id combination or the necessity to pass them to the server system before the End User input interface which Claim 1 does not permit. Furthermore in Steele at Column 16 line 54, the “user id”

refers to the End User record rather than the specification records and even if the User ID in Steele can somehow be construed to refer to a logon specification record it does not possess the other attributes of the logon identifier (or even the requestor identifier). In Steele, the Vendor ID in column 16 line 58 has similar problems and does not possess the characteristics of the logon id.

The distinctions and differences discussed above between Claim 1 and Steele are also present in Kanaishi.

#7-21 of the Office Action Letter: The distinctions discussed in # 6 above also apply to each of the claim rejections in #7-21.

#22. and 24-28 of the Office Action Letter: Claim 17 and Claims 18- 23 has been revised to disclose a system whereas Claim 1 and Claims 2-16 has been revised to disclose a method.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, the applicant submits that the claims are now in proper form and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicit.

Very respectfully,




Kevin Nip

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence and attachments, if any, will be deposited with the Canadian Postal Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents" on the date below.

Date: June 25, 2007

Inventor's Signature: 

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I certify that on the date below I will fax this communication, and attachments if any, to Art Unit 2132 of the Patent and Trademark Office at the following number: 571-273-8300.

Date: June 25, 2007

Inventor's Signature: _____

